

REMARKS

Claims 1-69 are pending.

Claims 1-69 stand rejected.

Claims 1-13, 15-35, 37, 39-43, 45-48, 51-55, 57-62, and 64-69 have been amended.

Claims 14, 36, 38, 44, 49, 50, and 63 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein.

Claims 70-74 have been added.

Drawings Objection

The drawings are objected to for failing comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(5) because they are missing various references mentioned in the description. Applicant has enclosed Replacement drawing sheets for Figures 4, 5A, and 8B, which have been amended to include the omitted references:

Figure 4 has been amended to include web page 400 and cursor 60.

Figure 5A has been amended to include web page 500.

Figure 8B has been amended to include hypertext link 870.

No new matter has been added.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to the drawings.

Specification Objections

The Abstract is objected to for exceeding 150 words. The Abstract has been amended to have 150 words or less and to better correlate with the invention as claimed.

The specification is objected to because of informalities in the May 9, 2001 Preliminary Amendment. Page 8, lines 3-4 has been amended to correctly reference Figures 22A and 22B.

Please disregard the previous amendment to page 6, lines 12-14 that referenced Figures 22A and 22B.

The specification on page 25, line 12 has been amended to refer to correctly “computer system 10”.

Claim Objections

Claims 37 and 51-69 are objected to because of various informalities. The claims have been amended to render the objections moot.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objections to the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-69 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claims are directed to an abstraction not within the technological arts.

Claims 1 has been amended to recite a computer system to provide one or more product selections to a user in accordance with an analysis of user needs.

Claim 24 has been amended to recite a computer program product encoded in a computer readable medium, the computer program product comprising code executable on a computer system to provide one or more product selections to a user in accordance with an analysis of user needs.

Claim 51 has been amended to recite a method to provide one or more product selections to a user in accordance with an analysis of user need. Claim 51 includes the useful and tangible result of presenting each identified product configuration and each identified pre-generated product configuration to the user via the communication link.

Claim 57 has been amended to depend from claim 51.

Claim 62 has been amended to depend from claim 51.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 14, 19, 24, 25, 26, 29, 36, 39, 44, 49, 51, 52, 57, 58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,907,320 issued to Beesley et al.(hereinafter “*Beesley*”).

Beesley relates to a “time-based method for controlling the storage and retrieval of multi-media information by the successive selection of the values of their attributes.” *Beesley*, Abstract. *Beesley* stores “item descriptions and their attribute-values.” *Id.*, col. 3, line 36. A user can select values of attributes and the system of *Beesley* attempts to match the values of attributes selected by the user with the stored attribute-values in order to identify an item having the user selected attribute values.

However, *Beesley* fails to teach or suggest receiving product related data that can be “a member of a group of information types comprising attribute information and product identifier information” as recited by claims 1, 24, 51, and 70. Furthermore, *Beesley* fails to teach or suggest “determine (“determining” claims 51 and 70) which type of information is included in the received product related data” as recited by claims 1, 24, 51, and 70. Additionally, because of the capability of operating on such different types of information, in contrast to *Beesley*, claim 1 includes both “a filter service module ... to process, if the product related data is attribute information, the received product related data in accordance with the product configuration information stored in the database and identify one or more product configurations that meet requirements of the received attribute information” and “a configuration service module to identify one or more of the pre-generated product configurations stored in the database that corresponds to the received product related data, if the product related data is product identifier information.”

Notably, in contrast to *Beesley*, the filter service module of claim 1 recites “to process ... the received product related data in accordance with the product configuration information.” The “product configuration information” comprises “product features and product rules governing allowable combinations of the product features.” *Beesley* “stores “item descriptions and their attribute-values.” *Beesley*, col. 3, line 36. *Beesley* does not include any teaching or suggestion to include “product features and product rules governing allowable combinations of the product features.”

Similarly, *Beesley* fails to teach or suggest instructions to “process (“processing” claims 51 and 70) product related data is attribute information, the received product related data in accordance with product configuration information and identify one or more product configurations that meet requirements of the received attribute information” and “identify (“identifying” claims 51 and 70) one or more of pre-generated product configurations that corresponds to the received product related data, if the product related data is product identifier information” where “the product configuration information comprises product features and product rules governing allowable combinations of the product features” as required by claims 24, 51, and 70.

Furthermore, *Beesley* teaches matching user selected attribute values with existing stored items having matching attribute values. Accordingly, *Beesley* fails to teach further configuration of a user selected product or further configuration in accordance with product features and product rules governing allowable combinations of the product features. More specifically, *Beesley* fails to teach or suggest:

wherein the data receiving module is further configured to receive data indicating a user selected product, wherein the selected product corresponds to one of the identified product configurations, and the data receiving module is further configured to receive product configuration selections from the user to further configure the selected product, the computer system further comprising: a software configuration engine, stored in the memory, to generate configured product data corresponding to the product configuration selections associated with the selected product and in accordance with the product configuration information [that comprises product features and product rules governing allowable combinations of the product features]; and wherein the presentation module is further configured to present the configured product data to the user via the communication link. **Claim 3.**

receive data indicating a user selected product, wherein the selected product corresponds to one of the identified product configurations;

receive product configuration selections from the user to further configure the selected product;

generate configured product data corresponding to the product configuration selections associated with the selected product and in accordance with the product configuration information [that comprises product features and product rules governing allowable combinations of the product features]; and

provide the configured product data to the user via the communication link. **Claim 26.**

receiving data indicating a user selected product, wherein the selected product corresponds to one of the identified product configurations;

receiving product configuration selections from the user to further configure the selected product;

generating configured product data corresponding to the product configuration selections associated with the selected product and in accordance with the product configuration information [that comprises product features and product rules governing allowable combinations of the product features]; and

providing the configured product data to the user via the communication link. **Claim 62.**

means for receiving data indicating a user selected product, wherein the selected product corresponds to one of the identified product configurations;

means for receiving product configuration selections from the user to further configure the selected product;

means for generating configured product data corresponding to the product configuration selections associated with the selected product and in accordance with the product configuration information [that comprises product features and product rules governing allowable combinations of the product features]; and

means for providing the configured product data to the user via the communication link. **Claim 71.**

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of independent claims 1, 24, and 51. Applicants also respectfully submit that claims directly or indirectly dependent on independent claims 1, 24, or 51 are allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claim upon which each dependent claim depends.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 51, 52, 62-66, 69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated “CompuServe is ‘Loaded’ with Online Car Info” by O Leary (hereinafter “*O Leary*”).

O Leary describes a database that contains stores car information such as car specifications that can be searched to identify a specific car. Applicants respectfully submit that for at least the same reasons as presented above with regard to *Beesley*, independent claim 51 and dependent claims 52, 62, 66, and 69 are allowable.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 4-5, 7-13, 15-18, 20-23, and 50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beesley.

Claims 20-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beesley as applied to claim 19 and further in view of the Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary.

Claim 50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beesley as applied to claim 1, and further in view of O Leary.

Claims 27 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beesley as applied to claim 26.

Claims 30-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beesley as applied to claim 29 and further in view of the Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary.

Claims 37-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beesley as applied to claim 36, and further in view of O Leary.

Claims 40-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beesley as applied to claim 36.

Claims 45-48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beesley as applied to claim 36 and further in view of the Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary.

Claim 53 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beesley as applied to claim 52.

Claims 54-56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beesley as applied to claim 51 and further in view of the Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary.

Claim 59 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beesley as applied to claim 58.

Claims 60-61 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beesley as applied to claim 57 and further in view of the Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary.


Claims 67-68 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over O Leary as applied to claim 64 and further in view of official notice.

Applicants also respectfully submit that claims directly or indirectly dependent on independent claims 1, 24, or 51 are allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claim upon which each dependent claim depends.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests that a Notice of Allowance be issued. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at 512-338-9100.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: MAIL STOP AMENDMENT, COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on March 14, 2005.

 3-14-2005
Attorney for Applicant(s) Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Kent B. Chambers
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 38,839